REMARKS

The non-final Office Action dated February 26, 2010 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 6, 9, 13 and 17 have been amended.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-20 remain pending upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the limitation "the intelligent network" in line 8 is alleged to lack antecedent basis in the claim. Applicants have amended the preamble of Claim 1 by adding the technical features "said Softswitch device implements an intelligent network service in the Next Generation Network." This amendment is based on the third paragraph on page 5 of the description and provides antecedent basis for the later recited "the intelligent network."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,424 B1 to Douglas et al. in view of U.S Patent 6,622,016 B1 to Sladek et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1

Claim 1 of the present application now defines:

A Softswitch device for a Next Generation Network, characterized in that said Softswitch device implements an intelligent network service in the Next Generation Network, and said Softswitch device includes:

a network adaptive device located at a bottom layer of the Softswitch device, the network adaptive device is for implementing communication between the Softswitch device and other devices in said Next Generation Network, as well as receiving call requests;

a call server in a higher layer of the network adaptive device, the call server is for determining whether the call received by said network adaptive device is a common call or a call of the intelligent network and processing the common call; and

an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP), Customised Applications for Mobile network Enhanced Logic Application Part (CAP) or Mobile Application Part (MAP) adapter in a higher layer of the call server, the adapter is for responding to the call of the intelligent network and encoding or decoding an INAP message.

Claim 1 of is directed to a solution for the technical problem of **interconnection of intelligent network services between PSTN networks and the next generation networks.** (Please see the third paragraph of the "Technical Background" section on page 1 for a detail.)

With reference to Douglas et al., however, it mainly relates to *providing IN (Intelligent Network) service access and reuse for IP end-point subscribers. (Please see lines 59~60 in column 1 of Douglas et al.,)*

Comparing Claim 1 with Douglas et al., there are at least the following two distinguishing technical features:

First, a "Softswitch device implements an intelligent network service in the Next Generation Network." It can be seen that the Softswitch device in Claim 1 can implement an intelligent network service in the Next Generation Network. However, Douglas et al. does not relate to the Next Generation Network.

Second "a network adaptive device located at a bottom layer of the Softswitch device, the network adaptive device is for implementing communication between the Softswitch device and other devices in said Next Generation Network, as well as receiving call requests; a call server in a higher layer of the network adaptive device, the call server is for determining whether the call received by said network adaptive device is a common call or a call of the intelligent network and processing the common call; and an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP), Customised Applications for Mobile network Enhanced Logic Application Part (CAP) or Mobile Application Part (MAP) adapter in a higher layer of the call server, the adapter is for responding to the call of the intelligent network and encoding or decoding an INAP message"

Firstly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Softswitch device in Claim 1 is different from the soft SSP (elements 14 and 22) in Douglas et al.

The claimed Softswitch device includes **a network adaptive device**, **a call server** and an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP), Customised Applications for Mobile network Enhanced Logic Application Part (CAP) or Mobile Application Part (MAP) **adapter**, which are located in different layers in the Softswitch device. Thus, **the Softswitch device in Claim 1 of the present invention is divided into different layers.**

In contrast, Douglas et al. discloses "the soft service switching point (SSP) 14 includes a call model 15 and a base platform 12" *(Please see lines 48 in column 3 of Douglas et al.,),and*

*it **does not** disclose any technical features about dividing the soft SSP into different layers.* Therefore, as a whole, the Softswitch device in Claim 1 is distinguishable from the soft SSP in Douglas et al.

Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that the network adaptive device in Claim 1 is different from the base platform state machine 26 (element 26) in Douglas et al.

As recited in Claim 1, "the network adaptive device located at a bottom layer of the Softswitch device, **the network adaptive device is for implementing communication between the Softswitch device and other devices in said Next Generation Network, as well as receiving call requests**"; and according to "a call server in a higher layer of the network adaptive device, **the call server is for determining whether the call received by said network adaptive device ... ,**" it can be seen that **the network adaptive device receives call requests and sends them to the call server, and the network adaptive device implements communication between the Softswitch device and other devices in said Next Generation Network. Thus, the network adaptive device is not merely a mediator between end-points.**

Douglas et al. discloses "*base platform state machine 26 services as a mediator between end-points*" *(Please see lines 55~58 in column 3 of Douglas et al.).* Therefore, the network adaptive device in Claim 1 of the present invention is distinguishable from the base platform state machine 26 in Douglas et al..

Thirdly, Applicants respectfully submit that the call server in Claim 1 of the present invention is essentially different from the local policy server in Douglas et al..

It can be seen from Claim 1 of the present application that the call server is a part of the Softswitch device. **And in order to implement the intelligent network service in the Next Generation Network, the call server determines whether the call received by the network adaptive device is a common call or a call of the intelligent network, and processes the common call.** Thereby, the Softswitch device can process the common call and **identify the call received by the network adaptive device as a common call or a call of the intelligent network.**

However, Douglas et al. discloses "*The IN call model may query a local policy server to determine what services the calling and called parties have subscribed to, at appropriate point in the call*" *(Please see lines 20~23 in column 11 of Douglas et al.).The person skilled in the art*

*should understand that intelligent network provides a lot of intelligent network services for users, and these users have to subscribe to these intelligent network services to use. The local policy server in Douglas et al. is used for determining what services the calling and called parties have subscribed to, but **not** used for determining whether the call is an intelligent call or a common call. Actually, Douglas et al. does not disclose the technical features "determine whether a call is a common call or a call of the intelligent network".* Therefore the call server in Claim 1 of the present invention is distinguishable from the local policy server in Douglas et al..

Besides, Douglas et al. does not disclose **"Customised Applications for Mobile network Enhanced Logic Application Part (CAP) or Mobile Application Part (MAP)"**. Douglas et al. only disclose *"The SSP can then decode the response and use the information within it as appropriate as it continues with call processing"* *(Please see lines 42~44 in column 5 of Douglas et al.),which are already defined by ITU.*

Claim 1 of the present invention defines an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP), Customised Applications for Mobile network Enhanced Logic Application Part (CAP) or Mobile Application Part (MAP) adapter in a higher layer of the call server, and this adapter is for responding to the call of the intelligent network and encoding or decoding an INAP message. **Thus Claim 1 defines an adapter which responds to the call of the intelligent network and encodes or decodes an INAP message. These functions of the adapter are essentially different from the *decoding the response in Douglas et al.*.**

At least for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 of the present invention is distinguishable from Douglas et al..

With reference to Sladek et al., it discloses a method and system for controlled provisioning of telecommunications services, *which solves that the tiered services arrangement can unnecessarily drain the resources of the central control point and the network, (Please see lines 5~11 in column 6 of Sladek et al.,)* Sladek et al. fails to teach or suggest the above distinguishing technical features of Claim 1.

Those distinguishing technical features of Claim 1 are not common general knowledge.

Therefore, there is no teaching in the prior art as a whole that would have prompted a person having ordinary skill in the art, faced with the above technical problem, to modify or adapt Douglas et al. while taking account of that teaching, thereby arriving at the technical scheme of Claim 1 with the above distinguishing technical features. So the subject matter of

Claim 1 is non-obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. Thus Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 of the present application conforms to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 2-5 depend on Claim 1 directly or indirectly, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as those for Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 6-10, 12-15 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S Patent No. 6,363,424 B1 to Douglas et al.. Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

Applicants have amended Claims 6, with the technical features "the Softswitch device including a network adaptive device, a call server and an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP) adapter" being added therein. The amendment is based on the third paragraph on page 5 and the second paragraph on page 6 of the description.

Claim 6

Claim 6 defines:

"A system for implementing an intelligent network, the system including a Softswitch device, at least one Service Control Point (SCP) and an IP network, the Softswitch device including a network adaptive device, a call server and an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP) adapter, wherein,
the network adaptive device is located at a bottom layer of the Softswitch device, the network adaptive device is for implementing communication between the Softswitch device and other devices in said network, as well as receiving the call request;
the call server is in a higher layer of the network adaptive device, the call server is for determining whether a call received by said network adaptive device is a common call or a call of the intelligent network and processing the common call;
the INAP adapter is in a higher layer of the call server, the INAP adapter is for responding to the call of the intelligent network and encoding or decoding the INAP message;
the SCP is for executing intelligent service logic and producing INAP messages; and
the IP network is for connecting said Softswitch device and the SCP."

For at least reasons similar to those stated above for Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Douglas et al. does not disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 6 of the present invention. So Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 6 of the present application is not anticipated by Douglas et al., and thus Claim 6 conforms to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claims 7-8 depend on Claim 6, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as those for claim 6.

Claims 9, 13 and 17

Applicants have amended Claims 9, 13 and 17 by adding technical features of "a network adaptive device in a Softswitch device", "a call server in the Softswitch device" and "an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP) in the Softswitch device". These amendments are based on page 8 to page 9 of the description.

For at least reasons similar to those stated above for Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Douglas et al. does not disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 9, 13 and 17 of the present invention. So Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9, 13 and 17 of the present application are not anticipated by Douglas et al., and thus Claims 9, 13 and 17 conforms to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claims 10, 12, 14-15, 18-19 depend on Claims 9, 13 and 17 respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as those for Claims 9, 13 and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,363424 B1 to Douglas et al. in view of U.S Patent No. 6826198 B2 to Turian et al..

For at least reasons similar to those stated above for Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that compared with Douglas et al., Claim 9 of the present invention includes **at least** the following distinguishing technical features:

(1) a network adaptive device in a Softswitch device transforming said call request issued by said PSTN telephone into a protocol format suitable for the next generation network;

(2) a call server in the Softswitch device determining whether said call request is an intelligent network service provided by the SCP or not;

(3) if said call request is an intelligent network service provided by the SCP, an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP) adapter Softswitch device encoding said call request into an INAP message and transferring the message to said SCP.

With reference to Turian et al., it discloses signaling transport protocol extensions for load balancing and server pool support, which *solves the technical problem of improving support for the introduction of server pools in packet based networks and achieving transparency for applications. (Please see lines 16~19 in column 2 of Turian et al..)* Turian et al. fails to teach or suggest the above distinguishing technical features of Claim 9.

Those distinguishing technical features of Claim 9 are not common general knowledge.

Therefore, the subject matter of Claim 9 is non-obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. Thus Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 of the present application conforms to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claim 11 depends on Claim 9, and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as those for Claim 9.

For at least reasons similar to those stated above for Claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13 and 17 also conform to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 16 and 20 depend on Claims 13 and 17 respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as those for Claims 13 and 17.

Conclusion

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Applicants also request that the Office telephone the attorneys of record in the event a telephone discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/derek. c. stettner/

Derek C. Stettner
Reg. No. 37,945

File No. 026613-9005-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
(414) 271-6560

T:\CLIENTA\026613\9005\A3916509.1